

Software Engineering Methods for Responsible Artificial Intelligence

Doctoral Consortium

Zahoor Ul Islam
Umeå University, Sweden
zahoor.ul.islam@umu.se

ABSTRACT

In order to ensure responsible Artificial intelligence (AI) applications engineering, we need to make sure that the development of AI systems is mindful of the consequences for individuals and societies. By anticipating the consequences of the design choices, reflecting upon the problem being solved by engaging all stakeholders and taking appropriate actions to ensure openness and the system's social, legal, and ethical acceptability. This research aims to develop an engineering process model by which ethical considerations can be addressed throughout the AI systems' software development life-cycle. The design methodological framework engineered in this PhD research will support aligning system goals with key ethical values by providing explicit values analysis and interpretation mechanisms, formal representation of ethical values, mechanisms for stakeholders participation in handling ethical deliberation, and providing support for governance and compliance mechanisms.

KEYWORDS

Ethical Values; Responsible AI Methodology; Software Engineering

ACM Reference Format:

Zahoor Ul Islam. 2021. Software Engineering Methods for Responsible Artificial Intelligence: Doctoral Consortium. In *Proc. of the 20th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2021), Online, May 3-7, 2021*, IFAAMAS, 2 pages.

1 INTRODUCTION

The task of designing robust and reliable autonomous systems is becoming a significant concern for many governments and policy-making organisations [2]. The impact of autonomous systems makes it crucial to consider not only technical robustness as a desired trait of the final system, but also properties and functionalities, such as *transparency* and *traceability*, and ethical considerations, such as *fairness* and *privacy* [3]. Several methodologies, grounded in system engineering practices, are available to support the efficient development of robust Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems. These methodologies have facilitated the development of systems in various application domains, from robotics to games to recommendation systems, influencing developers and indirectly affecting the society at large. While there is a consensus agreement on the need for responsible AI, there is a need to convert soft guidelines into functional and non-functional requirements. The contextual nature of ethical values poses another challenge [5]. Even if we can not find universal interpretations for values such as *fairness*, we

should still make our interpretations explicit and concrete through the development of relevant good-design practices. Taking lessons from established Software Engineering (SE) practices [1], we can develop a structured approach for values elicitation, aggregation, and interpretation.

This structured approach should maintain explicit formal links between values, norms, and systems functionalities that enable adaptation of the system to evolve perception and justification of implementation decisions in term of their underlying values [3]. It should also provide support to choose system components based on their underlying societal and ethical conceptions [3]. These approaches are required for the explainability of opaque algorithms, address biases in training data, solve adversarial issues (slight changes in training data that could have serious implications), and for the testing and formal verification in terms of *transparency*, *fairness*, and *accountability*. These so-called black box algorithms could have severe implications on society if not appropriately handled by AI design methods [4].

To develop trustworthy and human-centric AI systems, we need processes, tools, and methods for affected stakeholders. These methods will provide openness to AI systems and their potential impact on society, the environment, owners, consumers, workers, and citizens. It is the responsibility of governments, policymakers, and organizations to provide ethically aligned design policies. Several trustworthiness guidelines, including the one by AI4EU project by European Commission¹, have already been deployed. Methods are required to integrate these ethical guidelines in the Software Development Life-Cycle (SDLC) of AI systems. The responsibility of complying with ethical policies and guarantee accountable development of AI systems lies on *system engineers*, *project/product/process managers*, *designers*, *developers*, *regulators*, *auditors*, and *owners* of AI technology. The goals of responsible AI must be achieved at different levels, e.g., theoretical and technical levels. A multi-layered methodological approach where requirements are to be continuously analyzed, evaluated, and addressed throughout the SDLC. By structuring AI systems' development in terms of high-level motives and roles, it is possible to align with both the Design for Values and SE approaches. This PhD project aims to provide a framework for the responsible development of AI systems, such as requirements engineering of ethical values and their formal representation in SDLC by identifying and involving multiple stakeholders in the engineering process.

Proc. of the 20th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2021), U. Endriss, A. Nowé, F. Dignum, A. Lomuscio (eds.), May 3-7, 2021, Online. © 2021 International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (www.ifaamas.org). All rights reserved.

¹<https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/high-level-expert-group-artificial-intelligence>

2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- How to integrate ethical values in AI applications development life-cycle using an established set of Software Engineering Methods?
- How to design and develop a process model that can elicit, analyze, and preserve ethical values in AI systems' software design and development?
- How to formally represent, verify, and validate ethical values for AI systems?
- How to identify multiple stakeholders' intended role in an Artificial intelligence software development environment where the process is continuously planned, developed, tested, integrated, and delivered?
- How to design and develop implementation techniques that stakeholders could use to evaluate and maintain responsible development of artificially intelligent machines?

3 DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The process of identifying, integrating, designing, implementing, evaluating, and maintaining ethical values in the design of AI systems requires its methods to be systematically structured with the development life-cycle, participation support, and trustworthiness. Software development methodologies and best engineering practices to practically guide the system engineering process with ethical principles by stakeholders' active involvement can provide a useful quality management framework for solving challenges related to the development of responsible AI systems. Implementation and standardization of engineering practices are essential for developing high-quality and robust AI systems adhering to ethical values and societal norms. Therefore, it is essential to evaluate how current methodologies and their applications can support these issues. The standards of trustworthiness require soft guidelines to be translated into formal specifications using a well-established set of SE techniques. [1].

AI systems are also artifacts designed and developed by humans that require an established set of engineering practices. While different approaches, ontologies, taxonomies may be required for different AI application domains, trustworthiness criteria can be satisfied by applying established SE methods. A framework that provides a mechanism to integrates ethical values as exact requirements specification in the system engineering process by involving all stakeholders. Similar to how a "traditional" software life cycle starts with the requirements engineering phase, building a concrete policy starts with the ethical-requirements management phase. Then, it moves into assigning new "or mapping existing" governance mechanisms to satisfy the said requirements. Once this assignment is completed, compliance can be determined in the next step. This phase aims to set concrete requirements, each of them a moral value, on not only what high-level ethical principles the system needs to adhere. This framework will provide methods for fostering ethical, legal, social, economic, and cultural values by converting them into functional specifications that will inform the system's intent and operational interpretation transparently.

In addition to developing well-established SE life-cycle support mechanisms for AI systems and assessing engineering processes maturity, it is vital to ensure that AI system engineering design

choices also support Socio-Technical Systems (STS) engineering approaches. Such approaches to system development lead to more acceptable systems to end-users and deliver better value to stakeholders through implementing and re-evaluating ethical values in the initial design phase during system design. Maintaining a continuous and transparent reporting of the development process decisions and choices can be interpreted, verified, validated, and, if necessary, modified.

4 CONTRIBUTION AND FUTURE WORK

As the first step in this research, different aspects of existing AI engineering methods are explored and analyzed for different AI application domains such as *socio-technical systems*, *multi-agent systems*, *agent-based social simulations*, *architectures for embodied agents*, and *machine learning*. Selected methods are *Opera*, *EI/EIDE*, *JaCaMo*, *ABSS*, *Behaviour Tree*, *Goal-Oriented Action Planning*, *Behaviour-Oriented Design*, *FAtiMA*, and *SEMMA*. Existing AI development methods used in various AI applications domains do not wholly support SDLC. Furthermore, none of the existing AI development methods wholly support participation support and trustworthiness in the development process. Another survey related to ethical guidelines for trustworthy AI was performed. Our survey exposed various shortcomings in existing development methods and how lack of structured SE life-cycles approaches can affect the development of high-quality, transparent, and trustworthy AI systems. On the other hand, the survey also identifies some key findings for future methodology and how various operational elements and metrics from a well-established software development process can lead stakeholders and their development activities towards trustworthiness.

This PhD research aims to engineer a design methodological framework to elicit and analyze ethical values to be aligned with system goals and provide a mechanism for explicit interpretation, formal representation, verification, and validation of values. This framework will also specify governance mechanisms to ensure openness and support mechanisms for multiple stakeholders' participation. In the next step, ethical values will be systematically analyzed and mapped with SDLC, making it accessible for multiple stakeholders to do the ethical assessment of key values required for the desired system. Later the values will formally be verified and validated using formal methods.

5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is supported by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP) funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Pierre Bourque and Richard E. Fairley (Eds.). 2014. *SWEBOK: Guide to the Software Engineering Body of Knowledge* (version 3.0 ed.). IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA. <http://www.swebok.org/>
- [2] Virginia Dignum. 2017. Responsible Artificial Intelligence: Designing AI for Human Values. *ICT Discoveries* 1 (2017), 1–8.
- [3] Virginia Dignum. 2019. *Responsible Artificial Intelligence: How to Develop and Use AI in a Responsible Way*. Springer International Publishing.
- [4] A Theodorou. 2019. *AI Governance Through A Transparency Lens*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Bath.
- [5] Andreas Theodorou and Virginia Dignum. 2020. Towards ethical and socio-legal governance in AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 2, 1 (2020), 10–12.